

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed this application in light of the Office Action dated April 24, 2009. Claims 1, 4–7, and 9–12 remain pending. Applicants have cancelled claim 8 and incorporated its subject matter into claim 1. Claim 1 has further been amended to delete the claim language referring to extending auxiliary data files. The subject matter deleted from claim 1 has been reintroduced as new claim 12. Applicants have added no new matter. Applicants maintain that these amendments place the application in better consideration and satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Reconsideration of the rejection in light of the arguments and the amendments is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 8 includes allowable subject matter. Applicants have added the subject matter of claim 8 to claim 1. Claim 4, from which claim 8 depends, has not been incorporated, because the features of claim 8 do not require any of the features of claim 4. All of claims 4–7 and 9–12 now include the subject matter of cancelled claim 8 by virtue of their respective dependencies from claim 1.

Claims 1, 4–5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Coding of Parameter Sets by Hannuksela et al. (hereinafter “Hannuksela”).

Since claim 1 now includes subject matter which the Examiner deemed allowable, applicants assert that Hannuksela fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 now recites is in condition for allowance. Claims 4–5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and include all of its elements. Claims 4–5 and 7 are also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hannuksela in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,028 to Anderson et al. (hereinafter “Anderson”).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and includes all of its elements. Because claim 6 therefore includes subject matter which the Examiner has deemed allowable, it is respectfully asserted that Hannuksela and/or Anderson, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. It is therefore believed that claim 6 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 9–11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hannuksela in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,208 to Noonan et al. (hereinafter "Noonan").

Claims 9–11 depend from claim 1 and include all of its elements. Because claims 9–11 therefore include subject matter which the Examiner has deemed allowable, it is respectfully asserted that Hannuksela and/or Noonan, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 9–11. It is therefore believed that claims 9–11 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,
Carsten Herpel et al.

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
July 23, 2009